

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/634,843
Reply to OA dated December 10, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 11 are amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the Applicants regard as their invention. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. Claims 21-24 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. It is believed that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated **December 10, 2008**.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 14, 16, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul McFedries, in view of Jaaskelainen, U. S. Patent No. 5,835,088, in view of Wolfe, U. S. Patent No. 6,341,305, and in further view of Bonura et al, U. S. Patent No. 6,670,970.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul McFedries, in view of Jaaskelainen, in view of Wolfe, in view of Bonura et al, and in further view of Leavitt, U.S. Patent No. 6,918,091. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Amended independent Claims 1 and 11 now recite the limitation " . . . makes (making) a window corresponding to a title emphatically displayed among titles included in the title list active when a predetermined time has elapsed, so that the activated window is kept as it is until the predetermined time has elapsed while the title emphatically displayed in the title list is switched from one to another in succession".

Therefore, a process of making a window corresponding to a title emphatically displayed in the title list active does not carry out until the predetermined time has elapsed.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/634,843
Reply to OA dated December 10, 2008

It is respectfully submitted that neither McFedries nor Bonura teaches or suggests the aforementioned limitation as now recited in amended Claims 1 and 11.

On page 4, lines 14 to 16 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts:

While McFedries shows an activation processing unit for making a window corresponding to a title emphatically displayed among said titles included in said title list active (Fig. 25.3 shows the taskbar displaying a plurality of titles related to applications).

In addition, on page 4, lines 20 to 21 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts that Bonura teaches displaying a window after a predetermined time has elapsed.

Furthermore, on page 4, lines 22 to 27 of the Office Action, the Office Action asserts:

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the window switching apparatus of McFedries to incorporate displaying titles included in said title list active each predetermined time while titles displayed as said title list are scrolled, wherein said predetermined time is selected by a user of the apparatus as taught by Bonura, thus providing the user the benefits of an information-bearing floating window without having to move the floating window to reach underlying content (Bonura, 4: 1-3).

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/634,843
Reply to OA dated December 10, 2008

However, it is respectfully submitted that McFedries merely discloses a method for displaying a list related to windows on the taskbar.

Bonura merely teaches displaying a window after a predetermined time has elapsed.

In the above, even if *arguendo* the teachings of Bonura may be combined with the teachings of McFedries in the manner suggested in the Office Action, such combined teachings would still fall far short in fully meeting the aforementioned limitation as now recited in independent Claims 1 and 11.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have found the aforementioned limitation as now recited in independent Claims 1 and 11 obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on the teachings of McFedries and Bonura in combination.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish over McFedries, Jaaskelainen, Wolfe and Bonura, and should be allowed. Also, Claims 4, 7, 10, 14, 17 and 20 each depend from Claim 1 or 11, directly or indirectly, and should be allowed because they include the additional features discussed above.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-11, 14, 17 and 20, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/634,843
Reply to OA dated December 10, 2008

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP


James N. Baker
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,899

JNB/llf

Atty. Docket No. 030888
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE